



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,834	09/05/2003	Petri Nykanen	915-010.007	8401

4955 7590 02/13/2008  
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP  
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5  
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224  
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

SINKANTARAKORN, PAWARIS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/13/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/656,834

Applicant(s)

NYKANEN ET AL.

Examiner

Pao Sinkantarakorn

Art Unit

2616

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 25 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN 00 MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) ~~set forth in (b)~~ above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL -324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-14, 18-29 and 31-34.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
RICKY Q. NGO

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

On pages 1-3 of the remarks, regarding claim 34, the applicants argue that the claimed "communicating party" is distinguished from intermediate nodes/devices by referring back to the figures and the specification. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., parties that either generate or receive communications, but do not further forward communications) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

On page 3 of the remarks, regarding claim 34, the applicants argue that the server or the terminal of Craig is not dynamically addressed, but only the dynamically addressed router is dynamically addressed. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the server or the terminal is dynamically addressed) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

On page 4 of the remarks, regarding claim 34, the applicants argue that Craig only discloses "the Internet", and does not disclose any other network outside of the Internet. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., other network outside of the Internet) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

On page 6 of the remarks, regarding claim 1, the applicants argue that Craig does not disclose or suggest any wireless terminal which is reachable from outside of a first wireless communication network by means of said varying public addresses recited in claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as they allow. Craig discloses that a dynamically addressed router connected to the internet could be reached from outside of the internet by sending an update message containing IP address of the dynamically addressed router to the DNS so that other communicating party can obtain the IP address of the dynamically addressed router from the DNS and then reach the dynamically addressed router (see paragraphs 14-17). Broadly interpreted, the term "a first communication network" corresponds to the communication network between only the Internet 108 and the Dynamically Addressed Router 110.

On page 7 of the remarks, the applicants argue that Craig does not disclose or suggest conditionally giving out the current public address from an external name server according to conditions given in profile information associated with the identification information. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Craig discloses a method for conditionally giving out the current public address from DNS according to conditions given in profile information associated with the identification information (see paragraphs 18 -19). The condition for giving out the current public address of the dynamically addressed router is that a component not connected to dynamically addressed router wishes to send a message to a server connected to the dynamically addressed router, wherein the profile information is broadly interpreted as the component not being connected to the dynamically addressed router. The DNS does not give out the IP address of the dynamically addressed router all the time, the DNS gives out the IP address of the dynamically addressed router when a component not connected to the dynamically addressed router wishes to send a message to a server connected to the dynamically addressed router.

On page 8 of the remarks, the applicants argue that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Craig of a terminal registered by means of an identification information associated with the wireless terminal. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Craig discloses a dynamically addressed router in a computer network, but it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement a wireless computer network and wireless router. Furthermore, the applicants argue that the update message sent from the dynamically addressed router in Craig to the DNS does not contain identification information. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Craig discloses that the update message contains the current address of the dynamically addressed router, wherein the current address corresponds to the identification information.